REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 26, 2006. Claims 1-50 are presented for examination, with Claims 1-4, 19-24, 37, and 38 being in independent form. Claims 1-4, 19-24, 37, and 38 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-6, 15-24, 35-38, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 4,704,725 (*Harvey*) in view of U.S. Patent 6,588,012 (*Tanaka*); Claims 7-14, 25-28, and 39-42, as being obvious from *Harvey* in view of *Tanaka*, and further in view U.S. Patent 5,978,013 (*Jones*); and Claims 29-34 and 43-48, as being obvious from *Harvey* in view of *Tanaka*, *Jones,* and U.S. Patent 6,089,765 (*Mori*).

The present invention relates to a digital broadcast receiving apparatus in which a digital broadcast program and a partial content included in the program are set in advance. A feature of the present invention is to judge whether the received digital broadcast of the set program includes information related to the set partial content and to extract and print the information, without intervention of a user while receiving the digital broadcast, when the information is judged to be included. See, e.g., page 16, lines 17-24, and Fig. 6 of the present application.

For example, in a case where the digital broadcast program is a cooking program and a recipe is provided in the cooking program as part of the content of the

program, the recipe can be printed out.[1/] Notably, it is an aspect of the invention to set or designate the printing of the partial content in advance. Consequently, a user does not need to operate a receiving apparatus for printing while receiving the digital broadcast in order to obtain the printed information.

Claim 1 is directed to a digital broadcast receiving apparatus including means for setting a digital broadcast program and a partial content provided in the program, in advance, and means for receiving a digital broadcast of the program. Judging means judge whether or not the received digital broadcast includes information related to the set partial content, and means are provided for extracting the information when the judging means judge that the received digital broadcast includes the information. Printing means print-output the extracted information without intervention of a user while receiving the digital broadcast.

Harvey and *Tanaka* have been adequately discussed in previous papers, and that discussion will only be repeated to the extent deemed necessary.

The *Harvey* system, as understood by Applicant, relates to an apparatus for automatically controlling and monitoring radio and television transmissions. Apparently, this system can receive and print information relating to a broadcast, such as a recipe, when the user intervenes by pressing buttons, while the broadcast is being received (see col. 20, line 18 - col. 21, line 5).

The Office Action cites col. 20, lines 22-64, and Fig. 6D of Harvey in support of the rejection of Claim 1. The cited passage of Harvey refers to a recipe that can

1/ Of course, the claim scope is not limited by the details of the mentioned example or embodiments.

be printed when the user intervenes by pressing buttons, while the broadcast is being received .

In particular, at col. 20, lines 25-29, *Harvey* explains the steps the viewer needs to take to obtain the recipe while the television program is watched by the user. As such, in the system of *Harvey*, the user must first start watching the television program, and it is not possible to set the printing of the recipe in advance, as in the apparatus of Claim 1.

The *Tanaka* system, as understood by Applicant, relates to a combination terminal unit that receives various types of media signals, such as telephone, radio, fax, and cable television. As shown in Figs. 14 and 15, the user may perform a search of the various types of media by entering a search term. The results of the search are displayed in a list (Fig. 15), from which the user may select a desired program or other information to be retrieved. *Tanaka* further discusses a scheduler that establishes a line connection to a predetermined information entity at a time designated by the input device.

Thus, in the system of *Tanaka*, a program is located in a search according to a topic designated by a user, and the user can have the system record that program if it is a TV program or a radio program (see e.g., Figs. 11B and 12B, and col.12, lines 6-13 and 29-36). The topic indicates the whole program and does not indicate a partial content provided in a program.

The Office Action cites *Tanaka* for the feature of setting a digital broadcast in advance for future viewing. Applicant submits that nothing has been found in *Tanaka* that would teach or suggest printing without intervention of a user while receiving the digital broadcast.

Even if *Harvey* teaches receiving and printing information relating to a broadcast when the user intervenes by pressing buttons, while the broadcast is being received, and *Tanaka* teaches setting the broadcast in advance for future viewing, a combination, even if proper, would at most result in a system in which a broadcast can be set by the user in advance for future viewing and, while the broadcast is being received, permits the user to print information related to the broadcast by pressing buttons. Applicant submits that the combination would not teach or suggest printing without intervention of the user while receiving the broadcast, as recited in Claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that nothing in either *Harvey* or *Tanaka*, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any), would teach or suggest setting a digital broadcast program and a partial content provided in the program, in advance; judging whether the received digital broadcast of the set program includes information related to the set partial content; and extracting and printing the information, without intervention of a user while receiving the digital broadcast, when the information is judged to be included, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is seen to be clearly allowable over *Harvey* and *Tanaka*, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

Independent Claims 2-4, 19-24, 37, and 38 include features that are similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, and also are believed to be patentable over *Harvey* and *Tanaka* for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record, including *Jones* and *Mori*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art

discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. All of the independent claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200